# PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA PROGRAM COST COMPARED TO 2007-2008 OPERATING BUDGET PROGRAM COST PLUS EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL Roswell, NM: Group 1

	ARTESIA	CLOVIS	HOBBS	LOVINGTON	PORTALES	ROSWELL	RUIDOS
Cost Factor Values	erroral.		prometra	1,000,000	673000000	V Systematic	- 27/10/20
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	47.5%	63.1%	59.0%	59.6%	68.4%	69.6%	57.45
Percent English Learners	5.9%	10.6%	22.2%	17.3%	6.9%	10.5%	11.19
Percent Special Education (Census-based)	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.09
Percent Mobility	17.0%	26.6%	27.7%	18.1%	20.6%	25.6%	22.09
•Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	22.4%	21.6%	23.1%	22.4%	23.3%	22.0%	25.05
•Enrolment Share in Grades 9-12	28.5%	28.2%	27.6%	25.6%	25.5%	26.9%	28.85
Tatal District Enrollment	3.536.0	8.139.D	7,749.5	3,030.0	2,832.0	9.297.5	2.282.0
- I COLUMN COLUM	2,200.0	0,137.0	7,747.3	5,000.0	2,002.0	7,277.0	2.202.0
individual Formula Adjustments		- 1				- 1	
Student Needs				- 1		- 1	
Free/Reduced Lunch	1.157	1.201	1,190	1.192	1.216	1.219	1.188
•English Learners	1.005	1.010	1.019	1.015	1.006	1.009	1.010
•Special Education	1,291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291
• Mobility	1.030	1.046	1.048	1.032	1.036	1.046	1.038
10.000,000,000	1.030	1.040	1.040	1.002	1.000	1.040	1,000
Grade Composition  • Grades 6-8	0.998	0.996	0.999	0.997	1.000	0.997	1.004
	2011	190000000000000000000000000000000000000	0.000.000.000	0.948	0.967		0.983
•Grades 9-12	0.981	0.980	0.977	0.966	0.967	0.983	0.983
Scalo (Enrolment)	9.000	2.22	0.001	1 017	1 005	0.007	1.00
•Scalo	1.000	0.934	0.936	1.017	1.025	0.927	1.053
2 86 888		- 1	1		- 1	1	
Combined Adjustments	2.000	27722		0.000	127022	Nacional Property	120020
•Student Needs (all factors multiplied by each other)	1.548	1.638	1.641	1.612	1.637	1.662	1,606
Grade Composition (all factors multiplied by each other)	0.979	0.976	0.976	0.966	0.967	0.980	0.986
•Scale	1.000	0.934	0.936	1.017	1.025	0.927	1.053
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs × Grade	1,515	1,493	1,500	1.583	1.623	1.510	1.668
Composition × Scale)	1.010	1,475	1,000	1.000	1.070		1,000
ESCAL SCHOOL COLORS							
Base Per Pupil Cost	\$5,106	\$5.106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106
× Overall Adjustment	1.515	1.493	1.500	1.583	1.623	1.510	1.668
nitial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$7,735	\$7,621	\$7,658	\$8.085	\$8.289	\$7,709	\$8.51
× ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.017	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.046
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$7.865	\$7,621	\$7,658	\$8,085	\$8,289	\$7,709	\$8,91
94 400000 1980 1991 CP-1501 MANAGAMPE 240 1994 CP-1500 CAP 9	5.400			01.111.177	100000000000000000000000000000000000000		
× Total District Enrollment	3,536.0	8,139.0	7,749.5	3,030.0	2,832.0	9,297.5	2,282.0
Final Projected Sutticient Total (Program) Cost	\$27,810,605	\$62,023,431	\$59,346,563	\$24,497,478	\$23,473,056	\$71,675,849	\$20,335,020
		***********		74 months (1946-1970)		15.50(1)58(1)004(1)-1158	
Actual Program Cost (2007-2008 Operating Budget)	\$24,978,909	\$50,766,104	\$47,516,181	\$21,804,206	\$19,432,085	\$62,403,190	\$17,671,966
+ Emergency Supplemental	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2007-2008 Total Program Cost & Emergency Supplemental	\$24,978,909	\$50,766,104	\$47,516,181	\$21,804,206	\$19,432,085	\$62,403,190	\$17.671.966
2007 TOOL LOOK OF LINE A CHIEF CA SONDELIGIO	y24,770,707	VOU.100.104	947,010,101	V21,004,200	V17,402,000	202,400,170	\$17,071,70C
Tatal Marginal Sufficiency Cost = Final Projected Sufficient Total						f	
HT 2000 전에 NEW TOOLS TO TO THE TOTAL TO THE TOTAL TO THE STORE OF THE TOTAL TO THE TOTAL TO THE TOTAL TO THE T	\$2,831.695	\$11,257,327	\$11.830.382	\$2,693,273	\$4,040,971	\$9,272,658	\$2,663.054
(Program) Cost on line 36 – 2007-2008 Total on line 40		000000000000000000000000000000000000000	0 (72) 57 PAROSEN (57) (58)	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	40000000000000000000000000000000000000		
0	11.00	00.00	24.9%	12.4%	20.50	14.00	15.10
Percent Increase/(Decrease)	11.3%	22.2%	74.4%	12.4%	20.8%	14.9%	15.19

# 1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) ARTESIA

		User Input Cost Factors									
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forottment				
User Input Cost Factor Values	47.5%	5.9%	16.0%	17.0%	22.4%	28.5%	3536				

				Cost	Factors	The state of the s			
		Student I	Veeds		Grade Co	mposition	Sc	ale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic	
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029	
Transformed Demographic Values	1.475	1.059	1.160	1,170	1.224	1.285	3536	9.86.E+28	
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.157	1.157 1.005 1.291 1.030					1.0	000	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	BELOW STREET	1.54	8						
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment		in the same	ing the sign		0.9	979	The second	te l'editer e	
Combined Scale Adjustment				(Fig. 1) = (	State Company	LER CHE STA	1.0	000	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)				1.	515				
Base Per-Pupil Cost	decessins	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$7,735								
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.017								
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	- DAGGLEGE FORD			\$7	865				
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost			nest sending	\$27,8	10,605		and remarks	AM COM	
Actual Program Cost	acento entre			\$24,9	78,909	210,000			
Emergency Supplemental	EURORUEAUATA	MISOSNIA.			0		NUTRALE DE		
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$2,831,695								
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost		ALL VICES		\$27,8	10,605	S. H.C. LOTTON	NOW CONSTR		
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				11	.3%				

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
CLOVIS

		User Input Cost Factors									
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment				
User Input Cost Factor Values	63.1%	10.6%	16.0%	26.6%	21.6%	28.2%	8139				

		All the state of t		Cost	Factors		and the specimen		
		Student I	Veeds		Grade Co	mposition	Sc	ale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic	
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029	
Transformed Demographic Values	1.631	1.106	1.160	1.266	1.216	1.282	8139	1.63.E+35	
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.201	1.010	1,291	1.046	0.996	0.980	0.0	934	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	popular interest	1.63	В						
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment Combined Scale Adjustment			1		0.9	976	24,000,000	nato . IS	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)				1.	493		0.9	934	
Base Per-Pupil Cost		\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$7,621								
ISQ Formula Adjustment	William William			1.	000				
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	The House of	- VIEW PLEAS	and the same of th	\$7	,621	SALES DE L			
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost				\$62,0	23,431	A SERVICE			
Actual Program Cost			0.02450	\$50,7	66,104				
Emergency Supplemental	2022E045		Acres Cares	resument	\$0	UNIVERSE NA	-	AGWARDEL	
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$11,257,327								
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost		and the same		\$62.0	23,431			april 100	
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	22.2%								

# 1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) HOBBS

		User Input Cost Factors									
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment				
User Input Cost Factor Values	59.0%	22.2%	16.0%	27.7%	23.1%	27.6%	7750				

			A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	Cost	Factors	ne de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la c	90	Total -	
	V OT COMPANY	Student I	Veeds		Grade Co	mposition	Sc	ale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic	
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029	
Transformed Demographic Values	1.590	1.222	1,160	1.277	1.231	1.276	7749.5	6.76.E+34	
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.190	1.019	1.291	1.048	0.999	0.977	0.0	936	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	· Bookson Bridge	1.64	1 Carpage	ENEVE NO					
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment		and the	* 1 *	TANKS OF S	0.9	976	24	- N. W.	
Combined Scale Adjustment	Attended to the	0.93							
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	1.500								
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106								
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$7,658								
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000								
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost		of the Carting St.	MOSE PROPERTY.	\$7,	658	Surce		APPLICATION	
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	SENSON NO.	W.E. B. 13		\$59,3	46,563	A. Charle	1944 P 1972		
Actual Program Cost	DOWNERS -			\$47,5	16,181	nus sont			
Emergency Supplemental	G-MCCONTAIN		MAN ESTA		50				
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$11,830,382								
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$59,346,563								
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				24	.9%				

# 1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) LOVINGTON

		User Input Cost Factors									
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment				
User Input Cost Factor Values	59.6%	17.3%	16.0%	18.1%	22.4%	25.6%	3030				

			Annual Contract	Cost	Factors	A CONTRACTOR		A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR
	di omencari	Student I	Veeds		Grade Co	mposition	Sc	ale
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.596	1.173	1.160	1.181	1.224	1.256	3030	8.10.E+27
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.192	1.015	1.291	1.032	0.997	0.968	1,0	017
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	200000000	1.61	2	STATE OF THE R				
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment				till a s	0.5	966	and edition	
Combined Scale Adjustment		32 - 2		11 37 162	E		1.0	)17
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)				1.	583			
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							NAME OF TAXABLE
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$8,085							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	and accompa			\$8.	085	Transfer of		
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost				\$24,4	97,478			
Actual Program Cost				\$21,8	04,206	Zaraszus		MINISTER STATE
Emergency Supplemental	TARGET AND A				0		ERWINE TO	
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$2,693,273							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	EDOS GOS GOS	ALL DELLAC	HOYE HE	\$24,4	97,478		ASSESSMENT OF THE PARTY OF THE	Herence
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				12	4%			

# 1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) PORTALES

	User Input Cost Factors									
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Share in Grades 6-8	Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment			
User Input Cost Factor Values	68.4%	6.9%	16.0%	20.6%	23.3%	25.5%	2832			

	A CONTRACTOR OF THE SECOND	5 A 7 MA		Cost	Factors		V	200	
		Student I	Veeds		Grade Co	mposition	So	ale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment- Quadratic	
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029	
Transformed Demographic Values	1.684	1.069	1.160	1.206	1.233	1.255	2832	2.75.E+27	
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.216	1.006	1.291	1.036	1.000	0.967	1,0	025	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	American	1.63	7	Marin Are					
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment				the state of	0.9	967	100		
Combined Scale Adjustment			the thirt sa	1. 1. 1. 1.		100	1.0	025	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)		1.623							
Base Per-Pupil Cost				\$5	,106			-	
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$8,289								
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000							CONTRACTOR OF	
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost		Dicasia		\$8	,289	all the state of	2500 2501	THE WHO	
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	Balli Salous	YES A DE	BOUNES.	\$23,4	73,056				
Actual Program Cost			DESCRIPTION OF	\$19,4	32,085	540,000	er iverale	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	
Emergency Supplemental	AND PARK	State Concess		OF SERVICE	\$0				
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)				\$4,0	40,971				
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	- Investment			\$23,4	73,056	A SALES AND SE	Section 2	CANADA ENT	
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				20	.8%				

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
ROSWELL

	Leave to the second	User Input Cost Factors										
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment					
User Input Cost Factor Values	69.6%	10.5%	16.0%	26.6%	22.0%	28.9%	9298					

	A Second	A STRONG PARTY	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF	Cost	Factors	Samuel Warra		P. Statistics
	TERM SEVENIEN	Student I	leeds		Grade Co	mposition	Sc	ale
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment- Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.696	1.105	1.160	1.266	1.220	1.289	9297.5	1.82.E+36
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.219	1.009	1.291	1.046	0.997	0.983	0.9	927
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	SISSEMBRICH	1.66	2	Simple of	F			1
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment				1. 1.2	0.	980	Carlotte and the	
Combined Scale Adjustment				1000	Maria Jahan		0.9	927
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)				1.	510			
Base Per-Pupil Cost	Notice in Legal			\$5	,106	2012/12/20		
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost		er services	edavanua u	\$7	709	Loran Des	AND DESIGNATION OF	
ISO Formula Adjustment			4840077-01	1.	000	ulosalay/as	STATE STATE	Charles of S
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	DESCRIPTION OF			\$7	709	QUANTIES.	mwana na	
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	DECEMBER 1	OCCUPATION OF	outer dates	\$71,6	75,849			4015062
Actual Program Cost	ELECTION OF THE PARTY OF THE PA	acau,	E SURVEY	\$62,4	03,190			MARCH SE
Emergency Supplemental	DESCRIPTION (0.)	establica es	en alle vene		50			
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)				\$9,27	72,658			
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	TO COLORES	Application	eranstrans	\$71,6	75,849	Day and Sales		WHEN THE
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost		- 1124		14	.9%			

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
RUIDOSO

			User In	put Cost Fa	actors	Annual Control of the	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	57.4%	11.1%	16.0%	22.0%	25.0%	28.8%	2282

	No contract		No. Office Co.	Cost	Factors		and the same of the same	
		Student I	Veeds		Grade Co	mposition	Sc	alo
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	809.0	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.574	1.111	1.160	1.220	1.250	1.288	2282	9.32.E+25
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.186	1.010	1.291	1.038	1.004	0.983	1.0	053
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	E0000000000000000000000000000000000000	1.60	5	ar one				
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment				F11919	0.9	986		
Combined Scale Adjustment		The section	## ## P	A	2011	Se Million	1.0	053
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)				1.	668			
Base Per-Pupil Cost	He Designation			\$5	,106		nice/scale	SHE MINISTER
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	med / dealers			\$8	,517	ENGLISHED IN	VIOLULIA S	
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1 655, 20 m A S 4	MEDINE		1.	046	SHAW PORTOR	TOTAL SECTION	
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	The GARAGE WARREST		State of the	\$8	911	NO CATEGOR	NIKOLEHA	-
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	HEELON HEELONG	NO IL VIEW	alactica.	\$20,3	35,020			
Actual Program Cost	SERVING R	Secretary des	No. of State of	\$17,6	71,966		district in	Alfana Sarahaya
Emergency Supplemental	A LONG SERVICE	THE STATE OF THE S			50		Park I Marie	
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)				\$2,66	33,054			
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	A CANADA A CANADA		applications.	\$20,3	35,020	Part Colored		WALKING.
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				15	.1%			

# State of New Mexico LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES
Rick Miera, Chair
Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales
Jimmie C. Hall
Mimi Stewart
Thomas E. Swisstack
W. C. "Dub" Williams

ADVISORY
Ray Begaye
Nathan P. Cote
Nora Espinoza
Mary Helen Garcia
Thomas A. Garcia
Dianne Miller Hamilton
John A. Heaton
Rhonda S. King
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton
Jim R. Trujillo
Teresa A. Zanetti

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 PH: (505) 986-4591 FAX: (505) 986-4338 http://legis.state.nm.us/lcs/lesc/lesc/default.asp



SENATORS
Cynthia Nava, Vice Chair
Vernon D. Asbill
Mary Jane M. Garcia
Gay G. Kernan

ADVISORY
Mark Boitano
Carlos R. Cisneros
Dianna J. Duran
Lynda M. Lovejoy
Mary Kay Papen
John Pinto
William E. Sharer

D. Pauline Rindone, Ph.D., Director Frances R. Maestas, Deputy Director

May 7, 2008

# **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Legislative Education Study Committee

FR: D. Pauline Rindone

RE: PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA DISCUSSIONS

The agenda for the May LESC meeting includes proposed funding formula calculations of school districts, including committee and group discussions. For your information, attached are the guidelines and questions that were sent to public school district superintendents to facilitate discussions with the committee regarding the impact of the proposed funding formula on school district operations.

# State of New Mexico LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES
Rick Miera, Chair
Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales
Jimmie C. Hall
Mimi Stewart
Thomas E. Swisstack
W. C. "Dub" Williams

ADVISORY
Ray Begaye
Nathan P. Cote
Nora Espinoza
Mary Helen Garcia
Thomas A. Garcia
Dianne Miller Hamilton
John A. Heaton
Rhonda S. King
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton
Jim R. Trujillo
Teresa A. Zanetti

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 PH: (505) 986-4591 FAX: (505) 986-4338 http://legis.state.nm.us/lcs/lesc/lesc/default.asp



SENATORS
Cynthia Nava, Vice Chair
Vernon D. Asbill
Mary Jane M. Garcia
Gay G. Kernan

ADVISORY
Mark Boitano
Carlos R. Cisneros
Dianna J. Duran
Lynda M. Lovejoy
Mary Kay Papen
John Pinto
William E. Sharer

D. Pauline Rindone, Ph.D., Director Frances R. Maestas, Deputy Director

May 7, 2008

# **MEMORANDUM**

TO: Public School District Superintendents

FR: D. Pauline Rindone

RE: PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA DISCUSSIONS

You recently received a memorandum from the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) inviting you to work with the committee to examine the potential impact of the new public school funding formula that was proposed during the 2008 legislative session. You should have already received a copy of the LESC agenda for the May meeting that indicates your assigned group.

At the May LESC meeting, LESC staff will present your district's calculator and you will discuss with the committee how the proposed funding formula would affect your school district's operation to accommodate the needs of your students, as well as other issues related to the proposed funding formula. Hard copies of the calculators for the districts in your group will be available for reference and discussion.

In order to facilitate the discussions, LESC staff, with the assistance of the Public Education Department, have prepared the following questions, which will also be provided to the committee. The questions are a guide to assist you in preparing for your discussions with the committee. We understand that you may or may not be able to have complete answers to some of these questions prior to the meeting; however, it is important that we receive written responses to these questions from each of you. If you are not able to respond immediately, please send a copy of your responses to me as soon as you are able to gather the information.

# **Programs and Services:**

- How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula affect your district's program cost? 2. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula impact the educational programs and student services provided by your district? a) Educational Programs: b) Student Services: 3. Will your district use the additional funding resulting from the implementation of the proposed funding formula to reduce class size? If so, what grades, and how many classrooms would be affected? 4. What other changes might your district consider as a result of additional funding? 5. How will your district ensure that it provides all of the following educational programs and services as required in the funding formula bill, as amended, during the session?
  - bilingual and multicultural education, including culturally relevant learning environments, educational opportunities, and culturally relevant instructional materials;
  - health and wellness, including physical education, athletics, nutrition, and health education;
  - career-technical education;
  - visual and performing arts and music;
  - gifted education, advanced placement, and honors programs;
  - special education; and
  - distance education.

6. To the best of your ability at this time, please fill in the table below to identify the additional state-funded FTE that your district would be able to provide as a result of the implementation of the proposed funding formula:

Personnel	Elementary	Middle	High	Current FTE	Proposed FTE
Teachers			<del></del>		
Principals					
Counselors					
Nurses					
Physical Education Teachers					
Art and Music Teachers					
Social Workers					
Librarians					
Advanced Placement					
Teachers					
Gifted Education					
Intervention Specialists					
Bilingual Education					
Educational Assistants					
Special Education Teachers					
(excluding gifted)					
Ancillary and Support Staff					
Maintenance and Operations					
Staff (including custodians)					
Data Entry Clerks					
Other Central Office Staff					
Other School-based Staff					

### **Staff Salaries:**

The proposed funding formula would replace the current Training and Experience (T&E) Index with the Index of Staff Qualifications (ISQ). Although both indexes are designed to distribute additional funding to districts and charter schools based on the composition of their instructional staff, they are not identical:

- The T&E calculation is based on years of service and academic degrees for all instructional staff but does not reflect the three-tiered licensure system for teachers.
- The ISQ calculation recognizes not only experience and academic degrees but also licensure levels. It was calibrated on the average teacher salaries for each of the three levels and distributes additional dollars based on the proportion of teachers in each of those levels. In addition, there is a second calculation for those instructional staff, such as counselors, who are not included in the three-tiered system. Because the base per-student cost upon which the proposed formula is based already reflects the average salary by personnel category in the average district, the ISQ is applied only to salary costs in a district or charter school that are beyond the average.
- 7. If you have calculated your district's ISQ using the most recent matrices in the bill (see attachment), how would this factor impact funding for your district?

# **Special Education:**

8.		lents in your district have been identified as in need of special entage of your district's enrollment does this number represent? udents.)
	Number:	Percentage:%

9. How will the proposed funding formula's utilization of a fixed special education identification rate of 16 percent impact special education funding for your district?

# Gifted Education:

10.	Currently, how many s percentage of your dist	•		dentified as gifted, and what represent?	t
	Number:	_	Percentage:	%	
11.	students that have been	identified as gints be served.	fted to be in need of	not require districts to consider of special education, it does rict specifically address the	
Rev	enue Sources for Imple	mentation:			
12.	What revenue sources a district support?	for the additions	al dollars needed to	reach sufficiency would you	ur
Pote	ential Problems:				
13.	What problems, if any, the proposed funding for	•	ict anticipate will a	rise from the implementation	n of
14.	What problems, if any, formula is not implement	•	ict anticipate will a	rise if the proposed funding	
15.	Please feel free to identhat you feel the comm	•		oeen addressed in these ques	stions
xc:	Legislative Education	n Study Commi	ttee		

# ISQ-A - Teachers, Including Librarians

						Level							
Years Within Level	0 – 1			2-3	L	4-5						Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE Factor Adjusted FTE	sted FTE	FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	II.					FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's	0.64	0.00		0.67 0.0	00.0		8					0.00	00.0
Master's	0.68	0.00		0.72 0.0	00.00	0.76 0.	0.00					0.00	0.00
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	0.71	0.00		0.75 0.0	8		8					0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	00:0	00.0		00.0					0.00	0.00
						Level II							
Years Within Level	4-6			7 – 8		9 – 15		Over 15				Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE Factor Adjusted FTE	sted FTE	FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	E Factor Adjusted FTE	sted FTE			FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's	0.76	0.00		0.82 0.00	00		8	1.04	0.00			0.00	0.00
Master's	0.81	0.00		0.88 0.0	00	1.00	0.00	1.11	0.00			00.0	0.00
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	0.85	0.00		0.92 0.00	00		8	1.16	0.00			0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00 0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00		121223	0.00	00:00
						Level III							
Years Within Level	7 – 8			9 – 15		Over 15						Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE Factor Adjusted FTE	sted FTE	L ELL	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	<u> </u>					FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's	06:0	0.00		1.02 0.00	00	1.17 0.	00.0					0.00	0.00
Master's	0.96	0.00		1.09 0.00	00	1.25 0.	00.0					00.0	0.00
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	1.01	0.00		1.14 0.0	00	1.31 0.	00					0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	)'0	0.00 0.00		0.00					0.00	0.00
										M	Matrix Totals	00.00	00:00

# ISQ-B - Other Instructional Staff

Years of Experience	0-2	.2	e	3-5	u	9-8		9-15		Over 15	Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE Factor	FTE Factor Adjusted FTE FTE Factor Adju	FTE Fact	or Adjusted FTE	FTE Fact	Factor Adjusted FTE	FTE Fa	Factor Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's or Less	0.65	0.00	0.78	00:00	8.0	00.0 21		0.00				
Bachelor's + 15	0.70	0.00	0.83		9.0		_	0.96 0.00		1.00 0.0		
Master's/Bachelor's + 45	0.74	0.00	0.87	00.00	0.91	и 0.00		00.00		1.04 0.00	0.00	0.00
Master's + 15	0.78	0.00	0.91	0.00	5.1		•	1.13 0.00		1.17 0.0		
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	0.87	0.00	1.00	00.00	1.13	3 0.00		1.22 0.00		1.30 0.0		
Total	00.0	0.00	0.00	00:00	0.00	00:0	0.00	00.00	00.00	0.00	00.00	00:00
										Matrix Totals	00.00 str	00.00

GRAND TOTAL (ISQ-A+ISQ-B) 0.00 0.00 index of staff qualifications #DIV/0!